

22nd December 1922]

*Ceded Districts' representation in the Madras Educational Service.*

661 Q.—**Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR**: Will the hon. the Minister for Education be pleased to state the number of officers who are residents of the Ceded districts and are now working in them as sub-assistant inspectors of schools and are qualified for promotion to the Madras Educational Service?

**A.**—The Government have no information.

*Muhammadans newly appointed in departments under the Minister for Development.*

662 Q.—**Khan Babadur MUHAMMAD SADULLA BADSHA SAHIB**: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state the number of Muhammadans excluding peons and attenders that have been newly appointed in different departments under his control, such as the Veterinary department, Agricultural and Industrial department, Co-operative department, Mining department in the Presidency town, in 1921-22?

**A.**—The hon. Member is furnished with a statement below showing the number of Muhammadans excluding peons and attenders appointed, in the different departments under the control of the Development Minister in the Presidency town since 1st January 1921:—

Department.	Number of Muham-madans appointed since 1st January 1921.
Agricultural department	Nil.
Co-operative department	Nil.
Civil Veterinary department	1
Fisheries department	2
Industries department	6

The Mining department is not under the Development Minister.

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU:—“Sir, there is some mistake in the printed answer to question 662. The number of Muhammadans appointed in the Co-operative department is there shown as nil. As a matter of fact, one Muhammadan officer, Mr. Yusuf Ali, a Tahsildar drawing Rs. 180, was given a Co-operative Assistant Registrar's place on Rs. 250, during the period specified in the question. Later on, that officer left us, because he got another appointment in the Income-tax department.”

*Salary of non-gazetted officers.*

663 Q.—**Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI**: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state why the proposed revision of salary of the non-gazetted officers has not yet been given effect to?

**A.**—There are very few cases in which the revision has not been given effect to. In such cases the reason for delay is either that changes in administrative policy are being considered or that detailed proposals for the application of general principles to particular establishments have not been received by the Government.